

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars.

1. Rejection of claims 1-10, 24-29, 31-38, 40-50, 58, 61-66, 68, 69, and 71-81 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. patent no. 5,311,562 (*Palusamy et al.*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the rejection fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1. The remaining claims depend from claim 1, and are therefore patentable as containing all of the recited elements of claims 1, as well as for their respective recited features.

By way of review, the embodiment of pending claim 1 requires a system comprising at least one banknote processing machine, which is connected to a service center by means of a network. The system is configured so that data necessary for operation of the at least one banknote processing machine and/or data produced during operation of the at least one banknote processing machine are exchanged between the banknote processing machine and the service center via the network. Log files or statistics about deviations or irregularities occurring during operation of the at least one bank note processing machine are transmitted to the service center over the network, and the service center evaluates the log files or statistics and causes repairs to be carried out or wearing parts to be replaced before the at least one bank note processing machine fails.

In contrast to pending claim 1, the *Makino* publication discloses an ATM network where customer specific display screens and services are provided to individual customers based on stored attribute information for those customers (abstract; at least paragraphs [0009], [0010], [0016], [0061], and [0064]).

The *Makino* publication is completely silent as to log files or statistics about deviations or irregularities occurring during operation of the ATMs being transmitted to a service center over a network, and the service center evaluating the log files or statistics and causing repairs to be carried out or wearing parts to be replaced before the ATMs fail, all as required by pending claim 1.

On page 3, the Office action acknowledges that the *Makino* publication fails to disclose log files being evaluated to effect machine repairs. It is respectfully submitted that the *Makino* publication also fails to disclose log files or statistics about deviations or irregularities occurring during operation of the ATMs being transmitted to a service center over a network, and the service center evaluating the log files or statistics and causing repairs to be carried out or wearing parts to be replaced before the ATMs fail, all as required by pending claim 1.

The Office action next turns to the *Palusamy* patent, which discloses an integrated information system provided for a plant with interactive processes running in functional equipment subsets, such as a nuclear power generation plant (abstract).

The system of the *Palusamy* patent allows plant management and/or maintenance personnel to collect any available data regarding the subsystems operating in a plant or in an area of the plant, to coordinate maintenance and repair activities such that downtime for work on one or more articles or subsystems can be used for simultaneous work on other articles or subsystems (col. 2, line 67 through col. 3, line 5). Thus, an integrated diagnostic and predictive instrumentation for a number of different interdependent subsystems of a larger system is suggested for taking advantage of available synergies (col. 3, lines 19-23).

The diagnostics and maintenance arrangement makes information typically reviewed by different groups, such as control and safety or engineering and maintenance departments available to all such groups thus providing various useful lines of communication and data access availability (col. 3, lines 40-47; col. 5, lines 39-42; col. 7, lines 1-9).

To provide the data to the different groups, the system of the *Palusamy* patent generates prioritized reports to alert users to potential operational and/or maintenance problems (col. 4, lines 20-22).

The system of the *Palusamy* patent monitors demand levels on elements and decrements the remaining useful life of an element as a function of the demand levels to provide predictive and diagnostic capabilities (col. 5, lines 14-24). This is in contrast to pending claim 1, in which log files or statistics about deviations or irregularities occurring during operation of the at least one bank note processing machine are transmitted to a service center over a network, and the service center evaluates the log files or statistics and causes repairs to be carried out or wearing parts to be replaced before the at least one bank note processing machine fails.

While the system of the *Palusamy* patent does include sensors 50 coupled to data processing units 54, which are coupled to data acquisition means 56 for collecting and reducing data (col. 6, lines 1-6), there is no disclosure that the system of the *Palusamy* patent includes log files or statistics about deviations or irregularities occurring during operation of at least one bank note processing machine that are transmitted to a service center over a network, and the service center evaluates the log files or statistics and causes repairs to be carried out or wearing parts to be replaced before the at least one bank note processing machine fails.

In summary, neither the *Makino* publication nor the *Palusamy* patent disclose or suggest having log files or statistics about deviations or irregularities occurring during operation of at least one bank note processing machine being transmitted to a service center over a network, and the service center evaluating the log files or statistics and causing repairs to be carried out or wearing parts to be replaced before the at least one bank note processing machine fails, as is required by pending claim 1.

Since neither the *Makino* publication nor the *Palusamy* patent disclose or suggest having log files or statistics about deviations or irregularities occurring during operation of at least one bank note processing machine being transmitted to a service

center over a network, and the service center evaluating the log files or statistics and causing repairs to be carried out or wearing parts to be replaced before the at least one bank note processing machine fails, as is required by pending claim 1, the proposed combination of the *Makino* publication and the *Palusamy* patent also fail to disclose or suggest these features.

Accordingly, since the proposed combination of the *Makino* publication and the *Palusamy* patent fails to disclose or suggest every feature of pending claim 1, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established with respect to claim 1, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

As mentioned above, applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable and therefore, claims 2-10, 24-29, 31-38, 40-50, 58, 61-66, 68, 69, and 71-81, which depend from claim 1, are also considered to be patentable as containing all of the elements of claim 1, as well as for their respective recited features.

2. Rejection of claims 11-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. patent no. 5,311,562 (*Palusamy et al.*) and further in view of U.S. publication no. 2002/0046061 (*Wright et al.*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the *Wright* publication fails to provide for the deficiencies of the proposed combination of the *Makino* publication and the *Palusamy* patent, as discussed above in detail with respect to claim 1, from which claims 11-20 and 22 depend.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. patent no. 5,311,562 (*Palusamy et al.*) and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,508,398 (*Estes*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the *Estes* patent fails to provide for the deficiencies of the proposed combination of the *Makino* publication and the *Palusamy* patent, as discussed above in detail with respect to claim 1, from which claim 21 depends.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. patent no. 5,311,562 (*Palusamy et al.*) and further in view of U.S. patent no. 7,092,907 (*Kanevsky et al.*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the *Kanevsky* patent fails to provide for the deficiencies of the proposed combination of the *Makino* publication and the *Palusamy* patent, as discussed above in detail with respect to claim 1, from which claim 23 depends.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

5. Rejection of claims 30, 53-57, and 67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. patent no. 5,311,562 (*Palusamy et al.*) and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,430,470 (*Nakajima et al.*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the *Nakajima* patent fails to provide for the deficiencies of the proposed combination of the *Makino* publication and the *Palusamy* patent, as discussed above in detail with respect to claim 1, from which claims 30, 53-57, and 67 depend.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

6. Rejection of claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. patent no. 5,311,562 (*Palusamy et al.*) and further in view of U.S. publication no. 2004/0164141 (*Egami et al.*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the *Egami* publication fails to provide for the deficiencies of the proposed combination of the *Makino* publication and the *Palusamy* patent, as discussed above in detail with respect to claim 1, from which claim 39 depends.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

7. Rejection of claims 51 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. patent no. 5,311,562 (*Palusamy et al.*) and further in view of U.S. patent no. 7,395,241 (*Cook et al.*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the *Cook* patent fails to provide for the deficiencies of the proposed combination of the *Makino* publication and the *Palusamy* patent, as discussed above in detail with respect to claim 1, from which claims 51 and 52 depend.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

8. Rejection of claims 59 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. patent no. 5,311,562 (*Palusamy et al.*) and further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,363,164 (*Jones et al.*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the *Jones* patent fails to provide for the deficiencies of the proposed combination of the

Makino publication and the *Palusamy* patent, as discussed above in detail with respect to claim 1, from which claims 59 and 60 depend.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

9. Rejection of claim 70 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication no. 2002/0035541 (*Makino et al.*) in view of U.S. patent no. 5,311,562 (*Palusamy et al.*) and further in view of U.S. publication no. 2001/0051884 (*Wallis et al.*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the *Wallis* publication fails to provide for the deficiencies of the proposed combination of the *Makino* publication and the *Palusamy* patent, as discussed above in detail with respect to claim 1, from which claim 39 depends.

Further, the *Wallis* publication fails to disclose the features of claim 70, which features are acknowledged on page 7 of the Office action to be missing from the proposed combination of the *Makino* publication and the *Palusamy* patent.

In particular, in contrast to pending claim 70, which requires the service center to ask the operating person to deliver necessary replacement parts to the location of a banknote processing machine, the *Wallis* publication instead discloses an owner requesting pick up of a damaged item for delivery to a repair center (paragraph [0014]).

Thus, none of the *Makino* publication, the *Palusamy* patent, or the *Wallis* publication discloses the service center asking the operating person to deliver necessary replacement parts to the location of a banknote processing machine, as is required by pending claim 70.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

10. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that every pending claim in the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

Please charge any additional fees required or credit any overpayments in connection with this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-0200.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicants' attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: April 28, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick M. Buechner, Reg. #57,504/

PATRICK M. BUECHNER
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 57,504